

# C3 Business Plan Competition Rubric

Business Presenter(s):

Business Name:

Category	Score Range	Weight	Score
1. Problem and Customer Identification	1-4	15%	
2. Value Proposition and Solution	1-4	15%	
3. Financial Viability	1-4	20%	
4. Market Strategies and Metrics	1-4	15%	
5. Feasibility and Scalability	1-4	20%	
6. Presentation (Visual, Organizational, and Oral)	1-4	15%	

## Scoring Guidelines:

1. **Needs Improvement** – The participant meets only a few aspects of the criteria.
2. **Developing** – The participant meets some aspects of the criteria but lacks in others.
3. **Proficient** – The participant meets most of the criteria with solid evidence and presentation.
4. **Exemplary** – The participant meets or exceeds expectations in this category, with clear, compelling evidence.

\*\*\*A 0 point score may be assessed if the participant omits a category\*\*\*

## Calculation:

1. **Judge Total Score:** (Score in each category) x (Weight) = **Total Score for Category**
  - o Each judge scores independently and the scores are aggregated together / # of judges
2. **Final Score:** Sum of all category scores for each participant.

## Additional Scoring Considerations:

**Q&A Session:** Consider how well the participant responds to judges' questions when scoring the "Market Understanding" and "Feasibility" categories.

**Tie-Breaker:** In the event of a tie, judges will confer and decide based on overall presentation and potential impact. I believe the tie breaker should go to the business that is most feasible.

Judge Notes / Feedback:

Category	Lean Canvas Elements	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Needs Improvement (1)
1. Problem and Customer Identification	Customer Segments, Problem	- The problem is defined with exceptional clarity and depth, including supporting data or compelling evidence.	- The problem is clearly stated with adequate detail.	- The problem is mentioned but lacks sufficient clarity or depth.	- The problem is poorly defined or missing key details.
		- Customer segments are precisely identified with detailed profiles, showing a clear understanding of their pain points and needs.	- Customer segments are identified and described, with some evidence to justify their relevance, though minor details may be lacking.	- Customer segments are somewhat generic or incomplete, with limited supporting evidence.	- Customer segments are vague or not identified, with little to no supporting evidence.
2. Value Proposition and Solution	Unique Value Proposition, Solution, Unfair Advantage	- The UVP is exceptionally clear, compelling, and distinct.	- The UVP and solution are clear and persuasive, with a reasonable explanation of benefits.	- The UVP and solution are present but lack clarity or depth.	- The UVP and solution are unclear, unconvincing, or insufficiently developed.
		- The solution is concisely described and directly addresses the identified problem.	- The solution is clearly defined with adequate detail.	- The solution is mentioned but lacks real clarity or depth.	- The solution is poorly defined or missing.
		- The unfair advantage is seamlessly integrated, effectively differentiating the offering from competitors.	- The unfair advantage is noted, though it might need more explicit integration to fully differentiate the offering.	- The unfair advantage is mentioned but is vague or not well integrated into the overall value proposition.	- The unfair advantage is missing or poorly articulated, failing to set the offering apart from competitors.
3. Financial Viability	Cost Structure, Revenue Streams,	- Revenue streams and cost structures are thoroughly and logically mapped out.	- The financial model is clear, with identified revenue streams and cost structures.	- The business model is outlined but lacks sufficient depth or clarity.	- The financial model is poorly defined, with unclear or missing revenue streams and cost structures.
		- The financial model is realistic, detailed, and demonstrates a sustainable plan.	- Minor gaps in detail or analysis exist, but the overall model is sustainable.	- Revenue streams and cost structures are vaguely defined, with minimal supporting analysis.	- There is little to no evidence of a sustainable financial plan.
4. Market Strategies and Metrics	Channels, Key Metrics	- Comprehensive, clear data and metrics (e.g., pilot results, customer feedback, conversion rates) validate the market need.	- Adequate data and metrics are presented that validate the market need.	- Limited data or metrics are provided, and the evidence for market need is minimal.	- Little to no data or metrics are provided to validate the market need.
		- Customer validation is robust, supported by multiple sources of evidence.	- Customer validation is evident, though some areas could benefit from deeper analysis or additional evidence.	- Customer validation is weak or not strongly connected to the overall business hypothesis.	- Customer validation is absent or insufficient, failing to support the business idea.

5. Feasibility and Scalability	na	- A detailed and logical feasibility analysis demonstrates that the idea is viable in its current market environment.	- The feasibility analysis is solid, showing that the idea is reasonably viable.	- Feasibility is somewhat questionable, with limited analysis or insufficient detail.	- The viability of the idea is unconvincing with little to no feasibility analysis provided.
		- Clear, actionable growth strategies are provided along with well-considered risk mitigation plans.	- Growth strategies and scalability potential are addressed with adequate detail, though minor gaps may exist.	- Scalability is mentioned but lacks clear, well-supported strategies or actionable insights.	- Scalability is not addressed, and potential risks are largely ignored.
6. Presentation (Visual, Organizational, and Oral)	na	- The presentation is highly polished and professional.	- The presentation is well-organized and effective overall.	- The presentation is acceptable but lacks polish and may be somewhat disorganized.	- The presentation is disorganized and unprofessional.
		- Visual aids are engaging, clear, and effectively support the content.	- Visual aids are clear and supportive; the oral delivery is confident with minor areas for improvement.	- Visual aids are basic or minimally engaging, and the oral delivery is uneven or somewhat unclear.	- Visual aids are poor or absent, and the oral delivery is unclear, unengaging, and detracts from the overall message.